

Executive Summary

Introduction

The 25 million acre California Desert Conservation Area (CDCA) was designated by Congress in 1976 through the Federal Land Policy and Management Act (FLPMA). Many changes have occurred throughout the CDCA since FLPMA, including (1) approval of the CDCA Plan and its multiple-use class zoning and special designation strategies for protection of resources and provision of uses on public lands; (2) Congressional designations for 69 wilderness; (3) Congressional designations for national parks; and (4) listings of about 30 species under the federal Endangered Species Act (FESA). These actions significantly affect management and use of federal lands.

When species are listed, the ESA requires federal agencies to consult with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) on the adequacy of current land use plans to provide for species recovery. The affected federal agencies are the Bureau of Land Management (BLM), the National Park Service (NPS), the U.S. Forest Service, and various Department of Defense installations. State Parks and various other state and local jurisdictions are also affected where species listings also cover state or private lands. Ten land use plans or plan amendments are in progress, or have recently been completed. BLM's CDCA Plan, completed in 1980, is being amended through six concurrent plan amendments, one of them being this plan, the Northern and Eastern Mojave Desert Management Plan (NEMO). The NEMO planning area is located in the northeastern CDCA, primarily the eastern Mojave Desert and western Basin and Rangelands surrounding Death Valley National Park. When all plans are completed, they will provide a landscape approach to managing desert ecosystems.

Interagency cooperation has played a strong role in developing the strategies for conservation and recovery of listed species. Other affected interests, local, state, and federal agencies have been consulted during the process. A special subgroup of the Desert Advisory Council was formed to evaluate alternatives and look for additional grazing strategies, an issue that is of concern to local jurisdictions. Plan decisions apply only to public lands managed by the BLM. The Draft Plan/Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) was released in April 2001, and the public comment period closed in November 2001. The Proposed Plan/FEIS includes a summary of public comments and our responses. The Proposed Plan will undergo a 30-day protest period, and BLM intends to sign the Record of Decision in October 2002.

Purpose and Need

The CDCA Plan reflects both a general FLPMA mandate for multiple-use management and the specific direction provided in FLPMA, to develop the CDCA Plan and resolve issues of resource demands, use conflicts and environmental quality, with the direct involvement of affected interests. It was at this time that the Desert Advisory Council was formed. BLM's multiple-use mandate addresses a broad spectrum of resources and uses. The CDCA Plan purpose and need still applies. Within the NEMO planning area, the purposes and needs of this plan amendment are the following:

- Adopt standards for public land health and guidelines for grazing management
- Recover one federally threatened species, the desert tortoise
- Conserve one federally endangered, endemic species, the Amargosa vole
- Conserve two plants, the federally endangered Amargosa niterwort and the federally threatened Ash Meadows gumpant
- Conserve approximately 15 special status plants and animals and natural communities
- Incorporate designations and address unresolved issues from the 1994 California Desert Protection Act, including MUC zoning of released lands and a strategy for the Barstow-to-Vegas race course
- Designate routes of travel
- Adopt zoning adjustments for landfills on public lands
- Identify eligible rivers for the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System

To most effectively address these issues, great emphasis was placed on coordination with other agencies and interests, and generally coordinating this planning effort with adjacent planning efforts, especially with respect to desert tortoise conservation and related issues. Public lands in the CDCA make up 24 and 22 percent of each DWMA, with the remainder primarily from public lands in Nevada (managed by LVFO), and the Mojave National Preserve (NPS). Specific goals included:

- Coordination meetings on species and habitats, and shared issues between the major federal land management agencies (NPS, BLM)
- Cooperation in conservation of species and habitats with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and California Department of Fish and Game through their participation in a working team developing recommendations for conservation strategies
- Joint meetings with USFWS in Las Vegas and technical review of the conservation strategy by reviewers of the desert tortoise strategy adopted for the Las Vegas Resource Management Plan.

Since the CDCA Plan is being amended through six plan amendments, decisions that relate to broad programs must be consistent across all six plans and with the Purpose and Need and other aspects of the CDCA Plan.

Alternatives

The NEMO Proposed Plan and FEIS describes the Proposed Plan, and compares and contrasts it to a reasonable range of alternatives. For a comparative analysis of alternatives, see Tables 2.25 to 2.35 at the end of Chapter 2. Proposed actions that would fulfill the Purpose and Need for this plan apply to the public lands administered by the Bureau of Land Management, except where noted (e.g., proposed land tenure actions, on a willing seller basis). They are dependent on actions that have been approved within similar plans on adjacent federally managed lands, with respect to the recovery of the desert tortoise.

No Action Alternative

This alternative would continue current management. It would not provide reserve management for the desert tortoise and its habitat or for Amargosa vole critical habitat (as outlined in the Desert Tortoise and Amargosa Vole Recovery Plans, issued by the FWS), nor would it apply a watershed approach to managing the Amargosa River to address existing listed species and to reduce the possibility of future species listings under the ESA. It would (1) adopt national fallback standards and guidelines of rangeland health for grazing, and (2) provide for the conservation of two threatened and two endangered species. For the desert tortoise this involves the application of the current BLM California Statewide Policy for the desert tortoise. For the desert tortoise and the Amargosa vole it includes standard NEPA/ESA practices, including consideration of standard mitigation and compensation measures for use authorizations on a case-by-case basis and consultation with the FWS. For the two plants, procedures are similar, but compensation for take does not occur.

Measures and areas of consideration for special status species and natural communities would continue but would be less defined and focused. These include riparian management strategies such as tamarisk management for the Central Amargosa and other springs and seeps, and special designations, such as unusual plant assemblages, and areas of critical environmental concern. There would be minimal changes in management of livestock grazing resulting from the update of grazing guidelines consistent with current management policies. There would be no changes to wild horse and burro herd management; removals would continue until appropriate management level (AML) is reached in the Clark Mountain Herd Management Area and the Chicago Valley Horse Herd would continue to be managed under its AML for the reasonably foreseeable future. Habitat improvements and acquisitions for the desert tortoise and other special status species would occur on a case-by-case basis. Land acquisitions would be strategic for the desert tortoise and wilderness areas, and for other elements of ecosystems, if located within currently designated special areas. Routes of travel would be designated, resulting in the closure of a small number of routes. Management of federal lands administered by BLM, Mojave National Preserve and the Las Vegas Field Office would be much less integrated for common species and habitats.

Proposed Plan

The Proposed Plan is similar to the Preferred Alternative in the DEIS with some modification as a result of public comments and internal review. It provides reserve management for the desert tortoise, integrated watershed management for listed and special status species along the Amargosa River, including critical habitat for the Amargosa vole, and additional management strategies for special status species in other parts of the planning area. It also includes regional standards for public land health and guidelines for grazing management. At the heart of desert tortoise conservation is a system of desert tortoise wildlife management areas (from the FWS Desert Tortoise Recovery Plan) or DWMAs.

DWMAs would replace all current species and habitat special designations in those areas where they are proposed. Consideration was given to higher value use areas in the design of DWMAs, but DWMA design was also somewhat limited by DWMA design on adjacent lands and minimum acreage needed to approach DWMA requirements. DWMAs will be the same as or similar to critical habitat boundaries and be managed under BLM's area of critical environmental concern (ACEC) designation.

Currently development in reserve areas is generally low. The Proposed Plan would put in place measures to assure that the pace of development will not accelerate on DWMAs and the other ACECs in the planning area where listed species could be impacted by such development. Where acceleration of development is already a threat, proactive measures would assure adequate protection of sensitive public lands and resources, including T&E species and the Wild and Scenic Rivers.

Specific DWMA prescriptions include a 1 percent surface disturbance limit; seasonal land-use permits and strong reclamation requirements for surface disturbances; forage utilization limits on cattle; complete removal of burros in the DWMA to ultimately make this forage available for utilization by desert tortoise; standardization of desert tortoise categories within and outside of DWMAs and standardization of the compensation ratio for surface disturbance compensation within DWMAs (high value habitat); fencing along high traffic highways; parking and camping limits consistent with CDCA Plan limits for sensitive areas except they would be measured from centerline rather than the edge of the road (100 feet); and removal of predatory ravens. Routes of travel would be designated within the two desert tortoise subregions, which include the DWMAs. About 11 percent of the total length of routes would be closed, a 6.5 percent increase over the No Action Alternative. Another 8 percent would be limited (about half of the limited routes would be closed to motor vehicles in association with Ivanpah Dry Lakebed).

Specific strategies for other T&E and sensitive species include integration of existing ACEC strategies with new goals and objectives outlined in this plan, on the expanded Amargosa River ACEC. Riparian and river bottomland, alkaline salt playa (salt and brackish water marsh unusual plant assemblage) and mesquite bosque natural communities would be included in this ACEC. Specific prescriptions include securing water sources and water rights critical to species and habitats, maintaining and, as feasible, continuing to increase flow of the Amargosa River to sustain the natural communities within the watershed, maintaining the Tonapah and Tidewater railroad bed to prevent lowland habitat flooding, maintaining water quality by limiting construction-type activities, beginning a substantial demographics study of the vole to tell us where it is using the watershed and when, and what may affect it now and in the future, looking at potential for reestablishment of vole, addressing known predators, and reducing the threat of impacts to listed plants by trampling of horses and burros by limiting area proposed for ACEC to populations similar to current levels (12 or less horses, 0 burros). Other sensitive species would be protected through seasonal limitations and/or closures and additional measures that are standard for MUC Limited lands. The current Barstow-to-Vegas racecourse route would be eliminated from the CDCA Plan, and the CDCA map of competitive courses, and the Motor Vehicle Access Element of the CDCA Plan would be modified to limit organized competitive events to OHV Open Areas with a MUC of Intensive or to specified Courses identified in the CDCA Plan.

Additional interim consideration is provided to approximately 20 miles of the central Amargosa River (including most of the existing ACECs or proposed Amargosa River ACEC), portions of which have been found eligible under the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act for wild (6.5), scenic (6), and recreational (7) tentative classification, pending suitability analysis. Another 4 miles of Surprise Canyon Creek have been found eligible for scenic tentative classification, and 1 mile of Surprise Canyon Creek as well as almost 5 miles of Cottonwood Creek have been found eligible for recreational tentative classification.

Alternative 2

This alternative is considered the environmentally preferred alternative for listed species. It is essentially the same as the Proposed Plan in its strategic approach for listed and special status species on federal lands, with many similarities on designations and prescriptions for various uses. There are three major differences: 1) DWMA and ACECs are generally larger, 2) some specific use allocations are more conservative/restrictive {e.g., an additional 8 percent of routes of travel would be closed and all navigable washes would be closed in DWMA unless they are the only primary access routes in an area, camping restriction adjacent to open routes would be 50 feet instead of 100 feet from centerline, all forage would be allocated to natural species in DWMA, instead of providing for some livestock grazing, and some land uses would be more costly based on additional resources and time for permitting requirements to meet consultation timeframes}; and 3) land base within the Amargosa River ACEC includes more private lands, and would include a more proactive land tenure adjustment program in the riparian corridor. Alternative 2 was included in the Proposed Plan from the T&E Plants alternatives. This alternative generally captures the unusual plant assemblage (the alkaline soil/marsh natural community with which the listed plants have been associated).

Alternative 3

This alternative is the closest to the Proposed Plan, which in turn is a synthesis of all alternatives. It proposes a strategic approach for listed and special status species on federal lands, with many similarities on designations and prescriptions for various uses. There are two differences: 1) DWMA and ACECs are slightly larger as a general rule, and 2) some specific use allocations are more conservative/restrictive and others are less so. The modifications include providing for a burro herd outside of the DWMA in this alternative, but not specifically providing for EMZ grazing research in this alternative (e.g., a proposal developed through the DAC grazing TRT). There would be no change within DWMA to the competitive events strategy (Barstow-to-Vegas course would be removed from the CDCA Plan), but outside of DWMA, criteria and subsequent NEPA analysis would determine feasibility of a competitive event in MUC M and L, with public involvement. Alternative 3 was included in the Proposed Plan from the Amargosa vole alternatives. With respect to T&E plant conservation, Alternative 3 reflects the critical habitat alternative as opposed to the Proposed Plan, which generally captures the unusual plant assemblage (the alkaline soil/marsh natural community with which the plants have been associated).

Alternative 4

This alternative is an update of the No Action Alternative; with changes as necessary to meet minimum recovery plan goals and objectives. It proposes a strategic approach for listed and special status species on federal lands, with many similarities on designations and prescriptions for various uses. There are two differences: 1) one somewhat larger DWMA instead of two DWMA would be proposed for desert tortoise and ACECs would generally be smaller (overall acreage for both would be smaller), and 2) some specific use allocations are less conservative/restrictive. The modifications include no change from existing situation north of I-15 in Shadow Valley, which would be outside of the DWMA. That means the Barstow-to-Vegas racecourse would remain, the Clark Mountain burro herd would stay where it is, and two larger livestock allotments would not be affected by the DWMA. In the DWMA south of I-15, livestock grazing would continue with updated guidelines, except in one ephemeral allotment. Cumulative surface disturbance limits within the 5 percent larger DWMA would go up from 1 to 3 percent. The vole ACEC would cover critical habitat but would not include other public lands in the Amargosa riparian corridor that are potential vole habitat or upstream source waters.

Environmental Consequences

Effects analysis is based in part on the current and projected use in the NEMO planning area, which is generally low under the Proposed Plan and alternatives. The analysis below captures effects highlights, only. See Chapter 4 for a more complete analysis of effects. For a summary comparison of the impacts of the alternatives on all resources and uses, see Section 2.14, Summary of Impacts Tables, at the end of Chapter 2.

No Action Alternative

National fallback standards for rangeland health would be applied to grazing allotments only, and guidelines would be applied in the context of grazing management. Thus the health of the remainder of ecosystems would not be addressed. The array of authorized uses and disturbances would generally continue at current levels, with current mitigation and compensation measures. It would continue to be difficult to site new uses within critical habitat for the Amargosa vole. While this approach to recovery of threatened species addresses potential threats and site-specific needs for T&E species management, it is not strategic for T&E species conservation and recovery as a whole, and does not address ecosystems as a whole.

The BLM California Statewide Policy provides incentives to locate authorized disturbances away from high value desert tortoise habitat, but does not distinguish critical habitat from other high value desert tortoise habitat. The No Action Alternative does not address the tortoise sink along highway corridors that greatly increases mortality, and it allows a number of soil and vegetation disturbing uses to continue in critical and other important habitats without an upper limit. Each of these uses has a long list of mitigation measures and depending upon its nature may be required to occur during the tortoise hibernation period, after bat maternity roosting season, to have surveys of listed plants, or have other limitations on its period of occurrence or location.

However, the lack of strategic approaches to managing species and habitats puts at risk the recovery of the desert tortoise, the Amargosa vole, listed plants, and health of other special status species. Livestock and burro grazing are largely unaffected, but would be reduced where national standards assessments and monitoring indicate habitat stress. Continued management of burros at current levels has resulted in ecological declines in critical habitat (Shadow Valley) in the Clark Mountain Herd Management Area, based on the rangeland assessment. The Clark Mountain HMA has yet to reach the AML set in the CDCA Plan and balance forage allocation with that for desert tortoise and cattle in the HMA. The designation of routes of travel would benefit species and habitats in key places of sensitivity without further serious declines in opportunity or access to desert resources. Within desert tortoise subregions, including DWMAs, about 4.5 percent of the approximately 850 miles of existing unpaved routes (38 miles) and would be closed to motorized-vehicles, 1 percent of the routes (10 miles) would be limited, including 6 miles of navigable washes, and 94 percent of the routes (804 miles) would be open, including 43 miles of navigable washes. Approximately 72 miles of routes are undesignated (private lands, railroad and some other rights-of-ways) and are not part of the percentages.

Proposed Plan

Regional standards for public land health would be applied throughout the planning area. Thus the health of the remainder of ecosystems could be addressed in future planning and analytical processes. Adoption of a strategic approach for tortoise recovery and a watershed approach for the Amargosa vole, listed plants and special status species and natural communities should meet the recovery mandate and satisfactorily address the purpose and need identified in this plan. Within DWMA and ACECs, burros, livestock grazing, routes of travel, OHV use, competitive vehicle events, and other uses are moderately affected by conservation measures. New restrictions are not substantial. The reallocation of ephemeral forage to the desert tortoise will aid tortoise recovery. One of five allotments within, or partly within the DWMA would no longer support livestock grazing, but as it is rarely used, forage reallocation would have a negligible economic effect. The other 4 allotments would have increased costs of managing the allotment in springtime periods of low forage production when cattle must be removed from the DWMA portion of the allotment. Clark Mountain allotment would not be affected at all, as it would not be in the DWMA; neither would 11 other allotments.

Dumont Dunes OHV area is not affected by DWMA and ACECs, and recreational classification of a portion of the Amargosa River would not affect the use of roads and other recreation-based activities in the OHV area. Elimination of the burro herd in Shadow Valley will achieve and sustain the native species standard and eliminate the forage competition with desert tortoise and cattle in critical habitat. The Proposed Plan would also provide for the wild horse herd at its current size and prevent reintroduction of burros into critical habitat of listed species in Chicago Valley, where no burro herd currently exists. For future habitat acquisition in the NEMO planning area, BLM intends to favor acquisitions through exchange rather than through fee purchase to limit the impacts of reducing county tax base of San Bernardino and Inyo Counties. There would be no land/mining closures in this planning effort. Consideration may be given to additional closure during Amargosa ACEC planning, particularly in vole critical habitat based on identifying the best strategy to address potential conflicts with geothermal development over the long-term.

Mining, rights-of-way, and various other uses, would be little affected. There may be some increased costs associated with additional mitigation measures specific to desert tortoise, but most measures are already standard. Some rights-of-way could be relocated to areas of lower habitat value, but this already occurs frequently; marginal change is not anticipated to be substantial. Within desert tortoise subregions, including DWMA, about 11 percent of the approximately 850 miles of existing unpaved routes (94 miles) would be closed to motorized-vehicles, 8 percent of the routes (69 miles) would be limited, including 6 miles of navigable washes, and just under 81 percent of the routes (681 miles) would be open, including 43 miles of navigable washes. Approximately 72 miles of routes are undesignated (private lands, railroad and some other rights-of-ways) and are not part of the percentages. These changes in uses would result in improved vegetation cover, reduced habitat disturbance in high value habitat for all species, reduced forage competition, and reduced mortality of desert tortoises along major highways, in washes in areas of highest tortoise density, and for some other species at key locations. Given the small number of waters involved and their small visual intrusion, these waters would have a small effect on routes, and route designations would not substantially affect access to waters (see Table Q.2 in Appendix Q for route designation strategies to specific waters).

Alternative 2

DWMA are larger in size in this alternative, and it has a more positive effect for the desert tortoise and other ecosystem components than does the Proposed Plan, including a somewhat faster recovery of vegetative and soil components of desert tortoise habitat; and more complete watershed coverage in the Amargosa River, including more potential vole habitat and greater control of upstream land uses and seed source for tamarisk and other weedy species in the central Amargosa River.

However, impacts upon some uses and other values are greater in that measures are more restrictive for some uses. The elimination of grazing within DWMA's in six allotments, and reduction of use in remaining areas within three of the six allotments in areas outside of DWMA's, based on reduced forage, would impact livestock grazing substantially and require costly fencing and range waters construction in Valley Wells. Within desert tortoise subregions, including DWMA's about 19 percent of the approximately 850 miles of existing unpaved routes (161 miles) would be closed to motorized-vehicles, including 50 miles of navigable washes, 7 percent of the routes (62 miles) would be limited, and just under 74 percent of the routes (621 miles) would be open. Closure of all navigable washes in DWMA's would restrict the nature of camping, hunting, rock hounding, and some other forms of recreation. The impacts of reducing county tax base for Inyo County would be greater for this alternative, which includes additional private lands in ACEC status. Other proposals would be generally similar to those in the Proposed Plan and have similar effects.

Alternative 3

Although similar in impacts in most respects to the Proposed Plan, DWMA's are slightly larger in size in this alternative, giving complete coverage to critical habitat as designated by US Fish and Wildlife Service. Biological impacts are similar, but impacts upon some uses and other values are greater or less in that measures are more or less restrictive for some uses, and DWMA areas are included which have use conflicts in this alternative, and cost/benefit to listed species was not determined to be great. The first of these areas is the western portion of the Shadow Valley. In the Proposed Plan the area would remain MUC "Moderate", and outside of the DWMA. Under Alternative 3, the area is included in the DWMA. This includes the area south of Turquoise Mountain and I-15, a popular rock hounding area. A second area is immediately adjacent to Nipton town site has been excluded from the DWMA in the Proposed Plan and is proposed to be used consistent with Recovery Plan environmental education objectives. Under Alternative 3, it would be included in the DWMA, and the proposed environmental education center on private lands would not occur.

Four allotments would have higher costs of managing the allotment due to longer periods (springtime through fall) when cattle must be removed from the DWMA portion of the allotment during periods of low forage. Since EMZ grazing research is not provided for, the alternative grazing strategy that has been put forth for Valley Wells, if it is funded, would not be entertained by BLM and FWS under this alternative. Burros would be removed from Shadow Valley as in the Proposed Plan, but would remain on the east side of Clark Mountain, and continue to be gathered until AML is reached in the new Clark Mountain HMA located outside of critical habitat. The routes of travel network would be similar to the Proposed Plan; but it does not include changes from public comments. Other proposals would be generally similar to those in the Proposed Plan and have similar effects.

Alternative 4

Although strategic and comprehensive for the tortoise and other ecosystem elements, there are significant departures from the Proposed Plan and the other two action alternatives, including a 3 percent limit on surface disturbance in DWMA's, no DWMA coverage north of I-15, which includes 114,060 acres of critical habitat, and less change to certain uses that bring it closer to the No Action Alternative. These differences increase the risk for tortoise recovery. Burro management levels could result in greater conflicts with desert tortoise in Shadow Valley, and require additional resources to meet and sustain the native species standard. Elimination of Shadow Valley as critical habitat would provide for the Barstow-to-Vegas competitive racecourse, which would result in additional impacts to the soil and vegetation in the vicinity of the course. Within desert tortoise subregions, including DWMA's, about 10 percent of the approximately 850 miles of existing unpaved routes (87 miles) would be closed to motorized-vehicles, 8 percent of the routes (69 miles) would be limited, including 6 miles of navigable washes, and 81 percent of the routes (688 miles) would be open, including 43 miles of navigable washes. Other proposals would be similar to those in the Proposed Plan and have similar effects.

Cumulative Impacts

In most of the United States, our undeveloped public land base has continued to slowly shrink as population and development pressures have grown. It is happening to the east of the NEMO planning area in the Las Vegas Valley, which has been the fastest growing metro area in the United States at least since 1990. The CDCA is no exception. And over several decades about half of the CDCA has been Congressionally designated in set-aside areas for military, national park, and wilderness uses. As a result, resource access and uses are restricted or highly limited in these parts of the CDCA. The remaining half is equal parts federal and private land. CDCA Plan decisions in 1980 recognized these trends, the conflicts inherent in them, and included programmatic zoning and an array of allocations for a variety of specific uses. The CDCA Plan has served, with some regular adaptive management (plan amendment) for 20 years.

Designations and plan allocations have addressed the needs for and affected most desert uses--vehicle access, public access, recreation, interpretive, educational, scientific, cattle and burro grazing, mining, and utilities--to recognize nationally important values and resolve conflicts. However, during the last 20 years, about 30 species of plants and animals have been listed under the federal ESA, and an additional 120 species are sensitive and considered as special status species by a number of agencies. Additionally, species on private lands in the western CDCA are under stress from urbanization. About 5.5 million acres are designated as critical habitat for listed species. The designation of 7.3 million acres for national parks and BLM wilderness areas in the 1994 CDPA did not resolve most species and habitats issues. This is the context for ten current plans and plan amendments in the CDCA. In addressing the noted species and habitats issues, it is anticipated that the six plans that will update and amend the CDCA Plan will add no new general closures, but will add a modest amount of new uses allocations and mitigation and compensation requirements. In urbanizing areas, lands for development and species preserves will be identified. Overall, species and habitats issues will be greatly resolved, and decisions will reduce the possibility of future species listings. Use issues on private and federal lands should diminish.

Using the Document

The NEMO Proposed Plan/FEIS is provided in two volumes. Volume I is the Proposed Plan and FEIS, including 42 maps referred to throughout the document. Volume II provides supporting, technical, and activity-plan level information in 23 appendices. Several appendices support discussion in the various chapters. These include species and habitats data, analyses, and methods; routes designations and rationale; and public comments on the DEIS and responses. Several appendices in Volume II, including Appendix A, the desert tortoise recovery strategy and Appendix U, the summary of comments and responses, are quite extensive, and have introductions or overviews to their contents. Appendix V and W also have broad overviews of the CDCA with respect to the species of concern.

With respect to Volume I, eight chapters are provided. Chapter One includes the purpose and need for the NEMO Proposed Plan/FEIS. Chapter Two identifies and discusses a reasonable range of alternatives to address the purpose and need. The Affected Environment section of this document is Chapter 3. A complete description of the resources can be found in the CDCA Plan and EIS and is incorporated by reference (40CFR 1502.21). The existing management for the Planning Area is summarized in Appendix K. Chapter 4 provides the analysis of environmental consequences for alternatives, including the Proposed Plan. Volume I also includes Chapter 5, which discusses Coordination and Consultation with other Agencies, Chapter 6 that provides a Glossary, and Chapter 7 on Implementation and Plan Monitoring. Figures referred to throughout the Proposed Plan/FEIS are found in Chapter 8.